Reply to Office action of 11/16/2007

REMARKS

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-8 and 21-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

US 5,858,398 as evidenced by US 3,578,591. Applicants have amended that claims to obviate

the rejection. As discussed in the telephone interview of February 6, 2007, Applicants have

limited the claims to detergent surfactants and eliminated claims to compositions further

containing lipids. Compositions taught by '398 contain both lipids and detergents. IN view of

the amendments, Applicants request withdrawal of the 102 rejection.

Applicants have amended claims 4-6 and 22-24 to eliminate claims to compositions

containing lipids and recite: a) the polypeptide is a protein (claims 4 and 22), b) polypeptide

consists of a biologically active, therapeutic, or diagnostically useful polypeptide (claims 5

and 23), and c) the detergent consists of a cleavable detergent. Support for the amendments

can be found in the specification on page 3 lines 2-5, page 6 lines 32-33, page 1 lines 12-14,

and page 13 line 31 to page 14 line 2.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-8 and 21-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US 5,858,398 as evidenced by US 3,578,591. Applicants believe the arguments and

amendments made above in response to the 102 rejection are sufficient to overcome the 103

rejection and request withdrawal of the rejection.

The Examiner's objections and rejections are now believed to be overcome by this response

to the Office Action. In view of Applicants' amendment and arguments, it is submitted that

claims 1-8 and 21-24 should be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kirk Ekena/

Kirk Ekena, Reg. No. 56,672 Mirus Bio Corporation 505 South Rosa Road

Madison, WI 53719

608-238-4400

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the USPTO on this date: Feb. 6, 2008

/Kirk Ekena/ Kirk Ekena

4